

14 January 1979

Dear Harold,

I've been lax in keeping up with correspondence again; sorry. I'll start with a response to your 1/6/79, and then work backwards.

As I understand it, you asked me to send you a copy of all of the latest batch of FBI documents (the ones Sylvia indexed; it was her ~~her~~ index I sent you) because you thought it would be too much trouble for me to pull the ones you marked as of special interest. Actually, it was very little trouble - it only took about 15 minutes - so I have just copied (and will mail tomorrow) the selected pages. That came to 180 pages, which is \$6.04, plus postage. So, I'm returning your check for \$35, and you can send me another one, for \$7.00 or whatever it adds up to.

However: I haven't yet refiled the selected documents, and won't for a week or so, so if you really want the whole batch, let me know and I'll have the rest copied. Offhand, I expect that the selected documents would include most of what would interest you. Either way is fine with me.

To clarify things for Sylvia - it was her index that was dated 8/26; I sent a copy on to you on 12/14. (The mail wasn't that bad!) As you requested, I'm returning your marked copy of the index with the documents. (Fourth class.)

The package you just got also included a good chunk of my personal FBI file, which I have not yet indexed. Enclosed is a list of serials in the ~~main~~ JFK files which I do not yet have. Bob Ranftel hasn't had time to dig them up yet, I guess. (If you ~~xxxx~~ have some volunteer helper who would like to pull and copy these items from your file, that would be fine; it shouldn't take too long. If you do that, please call Ranftel at 232-4452 to avoid duplication of effort. I understand that you don't have the time to dig these up yourself.)

Also enclosed: a list of the MLK hearings ~~handouts~~ (with some missing), which I suppose you already have, and my letter of 11 Dec 78 to the FBI re my personal files.

By the way, the CIA is now telling me that the long-promised last batch of JFK documents will be another 2 or 3 months! (That would make them about a year overdue.)

Interesting to learn that you've gotten some N.O. ~~XX~~ JFK files. I've still gotten nothing ~~x~~ on my request for the ~~xxx~~ pre-ass'n part, but I guess I should be expecting it soon. My guess would be that the first week's worth of post-ass'n files could be very revealing.

I called Guinn, talked briefly (he was in a meeting); wrote him a letter, and expect him to get back to me fairly soon. I'll let you know if he does.

I admire your dedication in keeping up your exercise - makes me feel guilty! Keeping up with a 2-year-old is hard work, but it doesn't keep me in shape!

Re your 12/30, re my comments in the AIB newsletter: I think the Washington rule is "never explain, never apologize," but for you I'll try. What I said about Blakey was in the context of the difference between him and Sprague (and of course limited to the JFK case; I don't think I know enough ~~x~~ about the MLK case - or didn't then, ~~xxxx~~ before the hearings ~~x~~ -- to offer an opinion.) My point was that I recognize a personal bias on my part, since Blakey has an academic style which goes over better with people ~~xxx~~ like me than the basic ~~x~~ Washington-lawyer hustle. The AIB interview might not have been clear, and certainly wasn't complete, but I'll stand by what I said in my 15-page ~~xx~~ draft and in the Inquiry article. I don't think my personal opinion of Blakey will make me less critical of the HSC's work than I would otherwise be, and certainly the point you made - the handling of the evidence against Oswald - is one I agree with (and, I hope, made explicit ~~x~~ in Inquiry).

You actually looked pretty pleased on ~~x~~ PBS (when Weiss testified), and I think we're entitled to some feelings of vindication. (It must be the California climate that keeps me optimistic.) It'll be an interesting year, anyhow. Peter Scott's reaction to all those silly editorials about a conspiracy involving just a few ~~maniacs~~ maniacs (therefore not a conspiracy at all) is that it's harder to refute nonsense than factual error, so we've got our work cut out for us.

Best regards ~~xx~~ to you and Lil.

Sincerely,  
*Paul* PLH

cc: SM